



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

and fractured into numerous cults, creeds and classes, differing in variant degrees, but all unanimous in the opinion that their division is based on Truth, while all the others are fundamentally erroneous, and hence false and spurious as systems of religion.

Assuming that the Christian system is the one existing with divine approval, we find it likewise divided, sub-divided and re-divided into numerous sects, schisms and fragments, some differing merely in superficial detail, and others along lines as antithetic as they are fundamental.

If any one of these is identical with the primitive Church, established in conformity to divinely revealed Truth, it follows that all the others which are inconsistent therewith, or divergent therefrom, are inconsistent with or divergent from divinely revealed Truth.

We do not say that no modern Church conforms to the primitive pattern; for this would imply a knowledge of church conditions which we do not profess. Nor do we say that the range of our observation includes none such; for even this would imply an acquaintance with revelation and a wisdom of interpretation which modesty forbids we should assume. But we do say that if any Church within convenient reach claims such distinction, it would please us to be an occasional attendant on its ministrations.

And why not such a Church? It would evince, on the part of its adherents, a disposition to exalt private character and public worship to a conformity with divine standards; while opposition thereto would betray a desire to degrade divine standards to the level of a perverted human taste.

Justification for perpetuating the present schismatic condition of the modern Church is founded on two assumptions, viz:

1. It adapts the Christian System to the variant human conditions.
2. As there is a germ of good in each of them, they should all be fostered and encouraged for its preservation.

The first of these has been refuted times without number; but it is sufficient to say that it is unsparingly condemned by the Scriptures.

The second needs no refutation; its fallacy becomes obvious on being reduced to the form of a syllogism.

L. J. COPPAGE.

CRAWFORDSVILLE, IND.

GERMAN MORALS

SIR,—The theory proposed by Mr. Ayer in your July number, that the indifference of the German people to justice, mercy and the rights of others is due to the doctrines of early Christianity, will not hold water, because all the peoples of Europe were subject to the same influences and have not developed the same characteristics. We cannot conceive of Holland, Norway, Denmark, or England rejoicing undisguisedly over the drowning of innocent neutrals, or justifying the barbarous treatment of non-combatants in Belgium. Why is it that Teutons outside of Germany recognize a code of ethics repudiated by those living in the old home? While the following reasons do not entirely account for this remarkable phenomenon, they may do so in part.

Just before the Christian era we find Teutonic tribes occupying nearly all the territory between the Danube, the Rhine, the Baltic and the Vistula. These tribes were continually fighting among themselves. Partly nomadic and partly agricultural, they were continually moving west and south. The Goths passed through France and conquered Rome, the Vandals subdued a large part of Spain and Northern Africa, the Franks conquered France, the Angles, Jutes and Saxons conquered Britain. In some cases they were amalgamated with the conquered people, as in the case of the Lombards and the Franks; in others they

established themselves and became a nation. Sometimes, as in case of the Danes in England, they reconquered lands conquered earlier by other tribes. In all cases they brought with them the seminal idea of the equality of the freemen, the election of the chief, and serfdom, the latter abandoned by degrees, the former the germ of democracy. In all cases the expeditions were organized by energetic chiefs who took with them a certain number of capable volunteers. Consequently there was a constant drain of the most independent characters westward. Those who remained were the conservative, the docile, the unenterprising. Thus we find in England a nation of "kickers," jealous of their rights, ready to fight their chiefs, and, in modern days, to "write to the *Times*." They went so far as to execute one of their kings because he did not respect the ancient rights of the freemen. Those who remained behind in Germany have never executed a tyrant though they suffered under his exactions. Except in Switzerland they submitted to exactions and oppressions.

In Berlin ten years ago, the people did not resent, energetically, insults by their army officers which in England or this country, where many enterprising Englishmen fled in the seventeenth century, would have provoked instant retaliation regardless of personal danger. How can we account for this except by supposing that for two thousand years the bold, energetic, irascible, individualistic men had been drained off to the west, taking their women with them or intermarrying with Gauls and British Celts, raising children who should carry out the English and French and American Revolutions, and leaving behind in the old home the conservative, the docile, the laborious, who have not spirit enough to resent insults and impositions as long as submission will insure beer and sausages, who have never beheaded an emperor or a king in two thousand years. In no other part of the world has this social selection been carried out on so large a scale. It is true that there are some servile Englishmen and Frenchmen principally in domestic service, but many of these would fiercely resent a personal indignity beyond what they considered their rights. Furthermore, for several centuries bold and enterprising Englishmen have migrated to Canada, to New Zealand, to Australia. But they return whenever they can, they make every effort to have their children educated in England. They are not permanently detached. Consequently England has not become, like Germany, a horde of men lacking spirit to achieve freedom.

Men who lack courage for adventure are usually servile to superiors in social station and tyrannical to those below them. There is no other such brutal tyrant as the German non-commissioned officer. If you do not insist on your own rights as an individual, you are not apt to pay much attention to the rights of others. The chivalrous qualities have been drained out of Germany, for they go with the energetic and enterprising qualities. There has been in Germany a survival of those most fit to be the tools of tyranny. In modern warfare obedience is the prime requisite. Acting in large masses, individual courage and initiative are not needed except in aviation. So a million Germans make as good a modern army as a million Frenchmen, though individually inferior in dash and reckless courage, and fighting for a less inspiring ideal—unwarranted conquest instead of defense of home and children. Which will prove the most lasting remains to be seen, though there can be little question which is the higher. But to a machine gun the cause is of little importance, and the German army has the morals of a machine gun.

C. F. JOHNSON.

HARTFORD, CONN.

GERMANY IN CHINA

SIR,—In the April number of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW there appears a letter from the pen of Mr. Ernest P. Horowitz on the subject of the former